

APPENDIX II

MEETING EVALUATION SUMMARY

PROCEEDINGS OF THE PROPOSITION 36 IMPLEMENTATION MEETING

NOVEMBER 5, 2001 SACRAMENTO

MEETING EVALUATION SUMMARY

Number of responses from participants who completed evaluations

PART I: PRESENTATION EVALUATION

	5 = Excellent	4 = Very Good	3 = Good	2 = Fair	1 = Poor	N/A = Not Applicable
General Session	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
1. Organization of presentation	9	30	15	2	0	0
2. Delivery of presentation	9	20	25	2	0	0
3. Relevance of content to objectives	9	24	19	4	0	0
4. Effectiveness of teaching methods	3	17	24	9	0	2
5. Time allotted for presentation	4	18	19	14	1	0
Breakout Sessions on Implementation Issues	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
1. Organization of presentation	10	26	13	3	0	2
2. Delivery of presentation	10	21	16	4	0	3
3. Relevance of content to objectives	19	22	11	2	0	0
4. Effectiveness of teaching methods	8	14	23	5	0	4
5. Time allotted for presentation	5	21	18	8	2	0
Building and Maintaining Effective Collaborations	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
1. Organization of presentation	15	14	19	4	1	0
2. Delivery of presentation	9	17	19	8	0	0
3. Relevance of content to objectives	8	19	19	6	1	0
4. Effectiveness of teaching methods	6	15	18	9	2	0
5. Time allotted for presentation	6	15	16	16	0	0
Breakout Sessions on Emerging Issues	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
1. Organization of presentation	6	17	21	8	3	0
2. Delivery of presentation	4	15	24	10	2	0
3. Relevance of content to objectives	5	20	17	11	2	0

4. Effectiveness of teaching methods	3	16	17	14	4	1
5. Time allotted for presentation	3	21	17	11	3	0
Breakout Sessions on Service Delivery Challenges	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
1. Organization of presentation	14	20	11	3	2	1
2. Delivery of presentation	14	18	11	5	2	1
3. Relevance of content to objectives	17	18	10	2	2	1
4. Effectiveness of teaching methods	12	16	13	4	3	2
5. Time allotted for presentation	10	16	14	5	5	1

PART II: PROGRAM EVALUATION

5 = Strongly Agree

4 = Agree

3 = Neutral

2 = Disagree

1 = Strongly Disagree

N/A = Not Applicable

Overall	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
1. The content was relevant to my work	14	27	6	3	0	0
2. The presentations were appropriately sequenced	7	22	20	1	0	0
3. The sophistication of the content was appropriate for me	5	24	13	8	0	0
4. My personal objectives were achieved	5	21	13	9	2	0
5. The physical environment was conducive to my learning	7	16	15	9	3	0

PART III. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Two hundred and twenty-five individuals attended the meeting. Fifty-seven completed Evaluation Forms. Twenty-six of the fifty-seven participants who completed the form provided written comments. The following is a summary of the most salient themes derived from the written comments:

What went well:

- Three participants commented that they liked the ability to discuss individual county issues with peers.
- Three participants offered thanks for the day's events, stating that there was clearly a lot of work involved in its preparation.
- Two participants stated that they enjoyed the comparable county sessions.

- One participant thought the end of day summary was helpful.
- One participant said this program brought current issues and information to small counties.
- One participant suggested that this program be mandated for judicial and county administrators, stating that it would benefit them.
- One participant liked the willingness to look at problem solving issues.

What could have been different:

- Four participants indicated that more time was needed for breakouts and Q&A, or that the program seemed rushed and could have been a 2-day event.
- Four participants stated that the program was too long, particularly the opening session, due to travel issues.
- Three participants noted that the content of the program needed to focus on more specific issues such as improving the system, actual implementation problems and solutions that would be helpful with smaller counties in the very early stages and/or counties that are in the later stages of implementation.
- Two participants indicated that the CSAT portion of the program was of limited value.
- Two participants indicated that there was not enough information sharing/open discussion/audience participation, and too much talk from presenters.
- One participant stated that the overall program was not related to Proposition 36.
- One participant noted that too much focus was placed on the larger counties.
- One participant stated that very little new information was given.
- One participant indicated that hearing individual county problems was not helpful.
- One participant noted that some facilitators seemed confused and unprepared to address questions and concerns.
- One participant expected more effort on solutions rather than reiterating problems.
- One participant noted that too many questions went unanswered.
- One participant stated that there needed to be more description on the breakout sessions.
- One participant pointed out that Native American/tribal coordination issues were not addressed.
- One participant pointed out that continuing resistance to methadone, LAAM, naltrexone, or their use as treatment options was not mentioned.
- One participant indicated that receiving information from ADP regarding education, guidelines, legislation, and other updates would be nice, rather than the audience providing most of the information and teaching.

The following comments were made regarding the environment:

- Three participants stated that the facilities were uncomfortable or too small for such a large group, and suggested requiring advanced registration and limiting walk-ins.
- One participant stated that the rooms were too cold.

The following questions were posed regarding the program:

- Two participants wondered if questions and feedback from the breakout sessions would be addressed and available to participants.
- One participant asked that CEUs be offered for MFTs and LCSWs.